R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 856 24

FACTORS RELATED TO APPLICATION, ADMISSION, REGISTRATION, AND PERSISTENCE IN COLLEGE.

BY- REPPERT, HAROLD C. AND OTHERS
TEMPLE UNIV., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-166 PUB DATE 58
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-6533
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.92 73P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STUDENT PROBLEMS, *COLLEGE STUDENTS, COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, *COLLEGE ADMISSION, STATISTICAL SURVEYS, QUESTIONNAIRES, *WITHDRAWAL, *EXPENDITURES, UNIVERSITIES, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

THE PROBLEMS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS AND ADMINISTRATIONS WERE STUDIED IN THE AREAS OF FINANCIAL NEEDS, ATTITUDES, FUTURE PLANS, REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL, REASONS FOR DECLINING ADMISSION, INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PROBLEMS, AND SPECIFIC PROBLEMS OF A LARGE UNIVERSITY. A COLLEGE POPULATION WAS DIVIDED INTO THREE GROUPS--A PURPOSIVE SAMPLE OF THE ACTIVE STUDENT BODY, WITHDRAWEES, AND THOSE WHO WERE ACCEPTED BUT HAD DECLINED ADMISSION. DATA WERE GATHERED BY ADMINISTRATION OF STANDARDIZED QUESTIONNAIRES. SEPARATE QUESTIONNAIRES WERE CONSTRUCTED FOR EACH OF THE GROUPS. THE CONCLUSIONS INDICATED THAT A BROAD COMPLEX OF FACTORS GOVERNED STUDENT DECISIONS ON REGISTRATION AND CONTINUANCE IN COLLEGE, WITH FINANCIAL PROBLEMS INDICATED AS A SIGNIFICANT FACTOR IN THESE DECISIONS. FURTHER RESEARCH WAS SUGGESTED ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF ATTITUDINAL, ACADEMIC, AND PERSONAL FACTORS TO THESE STUDENT DECISIONS. (RS)

ED003856

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FACTORS RELATED TO APPLICATION, ADMISSION, REGISTRATION AND PERSISTENCE IN COLLEGE

Research in Education

performed under United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Office of Education contract number SAE 6533

For Temple University:

Project Coordinator	John M. Rhoads, Vice-Provost
Project Director	Harold C. Reppert, Director, Testing Bureau, Department of Psychology
Research Assistants	Edwin E. Wagner, Instructor, Department of Psychology
	Joseph I. Shaffer, Graduate Assistant, Testing Bureau, Department of Psychology
	Dorothy A. Seegers, Publications Editor
Research Consultant	John F. Adams, Director, Bureau of Economic and Business Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	SECTION I (Form D): Information from active student body concerning problems of meeting college expenses	3
	Summary	16
II	SECTION II (Form C): Circumstances attending discontinuance of enrollment at Temple University	20
	Summary	31
III	SECTION III (Form B): Report on College Application, Admission, and Registration	33
	Summary	46
IV	SECTION IV: An Overview	48
APPENDIX		56

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
Ia	Percentage breakdown of sample in terms of sex, and class of respondents	5
Ib	Percent of college finances provided by family and relatives	5
Ic	Percent of college finances provided by personal savings	6
Id	Percent of college finances provided by on-campus work	6
Ie	Percent of college finances provided by off-campus work	7
If	Percent of college finances provided by church funds	7
Ig	Percent of college finances provided by civic organizations	8
Ih	Percent of college finances provided by college scholarships	8
Ii	Percent of college finances provided by other scholarships.	9
Ij	Percent of college finances provided by college loan funds	9
Ik	Percent of college finances provided by other loans	10
Il	Percent of college finances provided by other funds not elsewhere classified	10
Im	Total breakdown by percentage of all funds used to defray college expenses for the general student body of Temple University	11
In	Employment for the Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior classes of Temple University at the time the questionnaire was administered	12
Io	Hours per week employed for the Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior classes of Temple University	12
Ip	Occupational breakdown (including part-time jobs) for the Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior classes of Temple University	13
Iq	Percentage of estimated family income by category of class as reported by student respondents	14
Ir	Re-enrollment plans for the Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior classes of Temple University	15
Is	Attitude toward "College Experiences" of active student body of Temple University	15
IIa	Classification by class at the time of drop-out from Temple University	21
IIb	Quintile rank in high school graduating class of drop-outs from Temple University	21
IIc	Sex of drop-outs from Temple University	21
IId	Future plans concerning college enrollment for drop-outs of Temple University	22
IIe	Expected date of re-enrollment for drop-outs of Temple University	23
IIf	Breakdown of institutions (other than Temple) where drop-outs have re-enrolled (N=108)	23
IIg	Employment status of drop-outs from Temple University	24

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

TABLE		Page
IIh	Occupational status (including part-time jobs) for the drop-outs of Temple University as classified by the Dictionary of Occupational Titles	25
IIi	The one most important reason for leaving Temple University as reported by the 108 drop-outs	26
IIj-A	Additional factors (other than those listed in Table IIi) causing drop-outs from Temple University	27
IIj-B	Additional factors (other than those listed in Table IIi) causing drop-outs from Temple University	27
IIk	Circumstances, which if altered, would have caused drop-outs to remain in college	28
IIl	Total breakdown by percentage of all funds used to defray college expenses for the drop-outs of Temple University (N=108)	29
IIm	Attitude of drop-outs from Temple University toward certain college experiences (N=108)	30
IIIa	Number of applications to colleges exclusive of Temple University for the admitted non-attendants at Temple University	35
IIIb	Institutions in which the admitted non-attendants of Temple University enrolled	35
IIIc	One most important factor for not enrolling in another institution for the admitted non-attendants of Temple University	36
IIId	Main factor for enrolling in another institution for the admitted non-attendants of Temple University	37
IIIe	Housing requirements of those students who had been accepted by Temple University but had not chosen to attend	39
IIIf	Quintile rank in high school graduating class for the admitted non-attendants of Temple University	39
IIIg	Number of applicants accepted without condition at other colleges for the admitted non-attendants of Temple University	40
IIIh	Number of applications accepted with condition at other colleges for admitted non-attendants of Temple University	40
IIIi	Number of applications rejected or placed on waiting list at other colleges for admitted non-attendants of Temple University	41
IIIj	Enrollment status at other colleges of admitted non-attendants of Temple University	41
IIIk	Time of admittance to another institution for admitted non-attendants of Temple University	42
IIIl	Total yearly amount of financial assistance received from other institutions by admitted non-attendants of Temple University	42

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

TABLE		Page
IIIn	Type of financial assistance received from other institutions by admitted non-attendants of Temple University	43
IIIn	Amount of financial assistance other than that listed in Table IIIl received by the admitted non-attendants of Temple University	43
IIIo	Responses of the admitted non-attendants of Temple University toward five attitudinal questions (N=136)	44
IIIp	Sex of the admitted non-attendants of Temple University	45
IIIq	Opionion of admitted non-attendants at Temple University concerning the following statement: Some authorities propose that colleges award the greater part of their limited scholarship funds on the bases of need and performance in college rather than on the bases of high school records, test results and/or recommendations	46
IVa	Chi square values, measures of significance, and contingency correlations between hours worked, family income and attitudes toward college experiences for 2351 students actively enrolled at Temple University	51

INTRODUCTION

The broad general purpose of this study sponsored by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare was to investigate the basic pattern of factors in the involved and intermingled problems of college students and university administrations in certain critical areas such as: (1) the financial needs of college students; (2) their attitudes toward their college experiences; (3) their future educational plans; (4) the reasons for the discontinuance of their college education; (5) the reasons for their declining admission to a university; (6) how these problems are interrelated; and (7) how they are particular to a large urban university.

The general college population at Temple University was divided into three distinct classes of students - each group having its own unique problems that affect university policy in different ways. These groups were:

(1) A purposive sample of the active student body of Temple University, consisting of 2,351 cases sampled either individually through answers to mail questionnaires, or collectively by administering these questionnaires in various randomly selected university classrooms.

(2) A sample of students who had discontinued their attendance at Temple University. Questionnaires were mailed to 300 such students and 108 replies were received.

(3) A sample of students who had been accepted to Temple University, but who had declined admission. 400 questionnaires covering such applicants for the school year of 1956-57 were mailed, and 136 replies were received.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

The students comprising these three groups shared certain basic problems in common. They must find means to finance their college education; they must come to a decision about which college or university to attend; and, when they have attended a college, they have certain attitudes toward their college experiences that reflect their personal problems. Moreover, for every problem the student faces, the university is confronted with a corresponding one of how to help the student. This study is oriented toward obtaining data which can be used to help formulate answers to these administrative problems.

In particular, Temple University undertook to investigate:

1. Are good students failing to enroll in college because of financial reasons?
2. Is Temple University unnecessarily losing good students to its competitors because of basic policy concerning scholarships and curricula?
3. Why do Temple University students drop out of college, and where does financial need rank in the pattern of factors leading to discontinuance of attendance?
4. At what point in a student's career is financial need a most critical factor, and what steps can the University take to alleviate the hardships of the student?

The data for the study was obtained from standardized questionnaires secured from the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which were mailed to students or administered in classroom situations. Separate questionnaires were constructed for each of

the three groups, despite the fact that this research methodology made a direct statistical comparison of the responses more difficult.[1] This study was planned so that each section could be interpreted independently. It was hoped that the large number of cases covering the active student population would yield a representative sample, but this cannot be guaranteed. Also, the problem of biased sampling due to differential replies to the mail questionnaires is manifest. Therefore, all the findings of this study are necessarily subject to the delimitations imposed by (1) the information obtained from the three questionnaire forms (see Appendix) and (2) the statistical limitations of the samples, which, although sufficiently large, could not be checked for freedom from possible bias.

SECTION I (FORM D): INFORMATION FROM ACTIVE STUDENT BODY CONCERNING PROBLEMS OF MEETING COLLEGE EXPENSES

Answers to a two-page questionnaire[2] were obtained from a cross section of the active student population of Temple University in order to yield insight into some general characteristics of the problems of students in a large urban university. The questionnaire, consisting of five major breakdowns, was designed to shed light on typical financial problems encountered by the student. The particular areas investigated were:

1. Estimates of the percentages of funds, in terms of sources, that were devoted to defraying total college expenses.

---

[1] Differences in the questionnaire format influenced any cross comparisons for the "attitudinal questions".

[2] See Appendix.

2. Estimates of parents' income.

3. Attitude toward college as reflected by "college experiences".

4. Scope and nature of gainful employment engaged in while attending college.

5. Plans for re-enrollment. Where withdrawal was contemplated, circumstances attending this decision were requested.

The information gleaned from this questionnaire was reduced to tabular form to convey a maximum amount of pertinent information. Brief statements are included summarizing the substance of each table. The tables are followed by a general summary which integrates and recapitulates trends and conclusions derived from the individual tables.

The responses to the questionnaires were obtained both by administering them in individual classroom situations, and by returns to questionnaires mailed from the Registrar's Office during the school years of 1956-57 and 1957-58. A total of 2,351 questionnaires, approximately half of the combined undergraduate population in the School of Liberal Arts, Teachers College, and School of Business, were obtained. Table Ia identifies proportionate representations by sex and class of this sample.

The responses obtained from the questionnaires were then analyzed in detail to reveal the major factors in the critical areas pertaining to our study. Tables Ib to Im show the variables involved in defraying college expenses.

TABLE Ia

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF SAMPLE IN TERMS OF SEX AND CLASS* OF RESPONDENTS

	Freshman (N=818)		Sophomore (N=626)		Junior (N=540)		Senior (N=367)		Total (N=2351)
	Percent of Class	Percent of Total N	Percent of Class	Percent of Total N	Percent of Class	Percent of Total N	Percent of Class	Percent of Total N	Percent of Class
Male	0.0	0.0	4.3	1.1	0.0	0.0	34.3	5.4	6.5
Female	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.6	0.0	0.0	15.3	2.4	3.0
Sex Unknown	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.8	1.1
No name given	100.0	34.8	92.3	24.6	100.0	23.0	45.2	7.0	89.4
Total	100.0	34.8	100.0	26.6	100.0	23.0	100.0	15.6	100.0

* Expected date of graduation:
1. Freshman - 1960
2. Sophomore - 1959
3. Junior - 1958
4. Senior - 1957

TABLE Ib

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY FAMILY AND RELATIVES

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	18.8	21.1	16.9	16.9	18.2
80 - 89	3.7	7.0	5.2	5.2	5.2
70 - 79	6.1	8.5	6.3	6.3	6.8
60 - 69	5.4	3.7	5.9	3.8	4.8
40 - 59	15.5	15.8	15.2	16.9	15.7
20 - 39	12.6	12.3	11.7	17.4	13 0
10 - 19	6.2	7.2	8.7	8.5	7.4
5 - 9	3.1	1.9	3.5	2.2	2.7
1 - 4	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.4
None provided	21.8	18.1	22.0	22.0	20.9
Uncodable Responses	6.0	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Ic

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY PERSONAL SAVINGS

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	2.4	0.6	0.7	0.5	1.3
80 - 89	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.8
70 - 79	1.2	1.3	0.2	1.4	1.0
60 - 69	1.2	0.6	0.7	1.1	0.9
40 - 59	5.8	3.5	3.9	5.7	4.7
20 - 39	13.8	12.0	14.1	10.6	12.9
10 - 19	11.4	13.6	13.5	16.1	13.2
5 - 9	7.7	7.7	8.7	8.2	8.0
1 - 4	1.6	3.5	3.2	3.5	2.8
None provided	48.7	51.9	51.5	49.0	50.2
Uncodable Responses	5.3	4.5	2.8	3.8	4.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Id

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY ON-CAMPUS WORK

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80 - 89	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
70 - 79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
60 - 69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
40 - 59	0.1	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.4
20 - 39	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.4	.8
10 - 19	1.0	4.0	3.3	3.4	2.6
5 - 9	1.2	2.2	2.4	5.8	2.4
1 - 4	0.7	2.9	2.4	3.5	2.1
None provided	94.0	87.7	89.1	82.7	89.5
Uncodable Responses	1.5	1.1	0.6	2.6	2.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Ie

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY OFF-CAMPUS WORK

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	3.2	4.3	2.6	3.8	3.5
80 - 89	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.3
70 - 79	1.7	2.7	3.0	3.3	2.5
60 - 69	1.2	0.6	3.2	3.0	1.8
40 - 59	8.1	10.5	14.3	12.8	10.9
20 - 39	14.6	16.6	18.3	19.4	16.7
10 - 19	10.5	10.7	13.7	15.3	12.0
5 - 9	5.9	4.6	6.1	7.1	5.8
1 - 4	1.3	3.2	3.2	1.4	2.3
None provided	48.4	40.4	30.9	28.3	39.1
Uncodable Responses	4.2	5.0	3.5	3.8	4.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE If

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY CHURCH FUNDS

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
70 - 79	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1
60 - 69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
40 - 59	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20 - 39	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.2
10 - 19	0.4	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.3
5 - 9	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1
1 - 4	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.4
None provided	98.2	99.2	98.2	98.9	98.6
Uncodable Responses	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Ig

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
70 - 79	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.1
60 - 69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
40 - 59	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1
20 - 39	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2
10 - 19	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
5 - 9	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.2
1 - 4	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.1
None provided	98.4	99.4	99.3	98.9	98.9
Uncodable Responses	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Ih

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.3
80 - 89	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.8	0.5
70 - 79	1.7	0.6	1.7	1.4	1.6
60 - 69	0.7	1.4	1.3	0.8	1.1
40 - 59	4.3	4.3	3.5	5.7	4.3
20 - 39	4.2	5.4	6.9	5.2	5.3
10 - 19	2.0	1.8	1.5	5.2	2.3
5 - 9	0.1	1.1	1.1	1.4	0.8
1 - 4	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.3
None provided	84.5	82.1	81.9	77.7	82.2
Uncodable Responses	1.6	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Ii

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY OTHER SCHOLARSHIPS

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	0.9	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.6
80 - 89	0.9	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.5
70 - 79	0.9	0.5	1.3	0.3	0.8
60 - 69	0.6	0.5	0.6	1.6	0.7
40 - 59	7.6	0.5	7.8	4.6	6.1
20 - 39	6.1	6.4	7.2	8.5	6.8
10 - 19	2.4	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.9
5 - 9	0.2	1.1	0.7	1.9	0.9
1 - 4	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.2
None provided	78.9	81.9	76.9	78.2	78.9
Uncodable Responses	2.1	1.4	1.7	0.8	1.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Ij

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY COLLEGE LOAN FUNDS

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
70 - 79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
60 - 69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
40 - 59	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20 - 39	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.1
10 - 19	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.4	0.3
5 - 9	0.0	0.0	0.2	2.2	0.4
1 - 4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.1
None provided	99.5	99.4	98.9	95.4	98.7
Uncodable Responses	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Ik

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY OTHER LOANS

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1
80 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
70 - 79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
60 - 69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
40 - 59	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.1
20 - 39	0.0	1.0	0.4	1.1	0.5
10 - 19	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.5	0.5
5 - 9	0.2	0.3	0.2	1.1	0.4
1 - 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
None provided	98.8	97.8	97.4	97.0	97.9
Uncodable Responses	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.0	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Il

PERCENT OF COLLEGE FINANCES PROVIDED BY OTHER FUNDS NOT ELSEWHERE CLASSIFIED

Percent	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
90 - 100	3.2	1.4	0.9	0.5	1.8
80 - 89	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.5
70 - 79	1.8	1.6	1.3	0.8	1.5
60 - 69	1.6	0.8	1.1	1.1	1.2
40 - 59	3.1	3.7	5.6	7.4	4.5
20 - 39	2.1	1.4	4.1	1.9	2.3
10 - 19	0.2	0.6	1.3	1.1	0.7
5 - 9	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3
1 - 4	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2
None provided	85.9	88.0	83.3	86.1	85.9
Uncodable Responses	1.2	1.3	1.3	0.5	1.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Im

TOTAL BREAKDOWN BY PERCENTAGE OF ALL FUNDS USED TO DEFRAY COLLEGE EXPENSES FOR THE GENERAL STUDENT BODY OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY (N=2351)

	Percent					Uncodable Responses* Percentage	Total Cumulative Percent Receiving Aid In Each Category
	1-19	20-39	40-59	60-79	80-100		
Family and Relatives	10.5	13.1	15.7	11.6	23.4	4.8	79.1
Personal Savings	24.0	12.9	4.7	2.0	2.1	4.2	49.9
On-campus Work	7.2	1.7	0.6	0.0	0.1	1.2	10.7
Off-campus Work	20.1	16.7	10.9	4.3	4.7	4.2	60.9
Church	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	1.4
Civic Organizations	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	1.1
College Scholarships	3.4	5.3	4.3	2.7	0.8	1.3	17.8
Other Scholarships	4.0	6.8	6.1	1.5	1.1	1.6	21.2
College Loan Funds	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.3
Other Loans	0.9	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.5	2.1
Other Funds	1.2	2.3	4.5	2.7	2.3	1.2	14.1

* Due to student errors in answering questionnaires.

The majority of students did not receive their major source of funds from scholarships or other public endowments. For most students, the family, personal savings, and off campus work constituted the chief sources of funds; monies received from all other scholarships and loans combined still totaled less than any of these three major sources taken individually. Few students derived expenses from only one source; most Temple University undergraduates utilized a combination of several sources to meet expenses.

Table Im shows that 71.6 percent of the students indicated that at least some of their college expenses were defrayed by employment. Tables In and Ip were designed to furnish further information on the nature and

scope of this employment. These tables are based on employment at the time the questionnaire was filled in and represent working status concomitant with attendance at college.

TABLE In

EMPLOYMENT FOR THE FRESHMAN, SOPHOMORE, JUNIOR, AND SENIOR CLASSES OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY AT THE TIME THE QUESTIONNAIRE WAS ADMINISTERED (N=2351)

Employment	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		Total
	Per-cent of Class	Per-cent of Total N	Per-cent of Class	Per-cent of Total N	Per-cent of Class	Per-cent of Total N	Per-cent of Class	Per-cent of Total N	Per-cent of Class
Full time	9.8	3.4	8.8	2.3	10.7	2.5	29.7	4.6	12.9
Part time	42.9	15.0	55.6	14.8	50.9	11.7	41.4	6.4	47.9
No employment	46.0	16.0	33.7	9.0	37.0	8.5	28.9	4.5	38.0
No response	1.3	0.5	1.9	0.5	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
Total	100.0	34.9	100.0	26.6	100.0	23.1	100.0	15.5	100.0

TABLE Io

HOURS PER WEEK EMPLOYED FOR THE FRESHMAN, SOPHOMORE, JUNIOR, AND SENIOR CLASSES OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Hours per Week	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
	P E R C E N T				
1 - 4	2.1	2.4	3.2	2.5	2.5
5 - 9	3.4	7.5	5.2	5.5	5.2
10 - 12	5.3	8.3	4.3	4.9	5.3
13 - 15	5.5	5.6	5.6	4.1	5.3
16 - 18	2.8	4.6	3.7	1.6	3.3
19 - 24	11.7	11.3	13.5	10.3	11.8
25 - 29	4.7	7.7	7.2	6.3	6.3
30 - 40	9.7	9.7	14.1	22.1	12.6
41 and up	2.8	2.6	2.8	7.4	3.3
Work but hours not reported	4.9	4.6	2.2	7.4	4.6
None or no response	47.2	35.5	38.3	28.9	39.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE Ip

OCCUPATIONAL BREAKDOWN (INCLUDING PART-TIME JOBS) FOR THE FRESHMAN, SOPHOMORE, JUNIOR, AND SENIOR CLASSES OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY (N=2351)

Dictionary of Occupational Titles Classification	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
	P E R C E N T				
Professional	4.0	5.2	5.1	15.0	6.3
Semi-professional	2.2	5.1	5.4	6.3	4.3
Managerial and Official	1.2	1.4	1.3	2.7	1.5
Clerical and Kindred	21.6	26.5	24.6	16.9	22.9
Sales and Kindred	11.9	11.6	10.0	10.1	11.1
Forestry, Agricultural, Fishery, and Kindred	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.2
Service	5.4	3.8	3.9	5.7	4.7
Skilled	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.5
Semi-skilled	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.4
Unskilled	1.9	3.2	1.7	2.7	2.8
Unemployed	48.0	38.3	43.2	35.4	42.4
Occupations not listed	1.6	3.0	2.6	3.0	2.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Tables In to Ip reveal that approximately 60 percent of Temple University undergraduates worked and attended school at the same time. Of these, 34.0 percent spent 19 or more hours in their jobs. Most students were engaged in Sales, and Clerical positions as coded in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (Table Ip).

Despite the fact that 79.1 percent of the students received financial aid from parents and family, approximately 60 percent reported that it was necessary to engage in some kind of work. The relationship of estimated parental income to class status is taken up in Table Iq.

In 32.9 percent of the cases, according to student report, family income was under $5,000, indicating that many families would be taxed to completely finance a college education.

TABLE Iq

PERCENTAGE OF ESTIMATED FAMILY INCOME BY CATEGORY OF CLASS AS REPORTED* BY STUDENT RESPONDENTS (N=2351)

Income In Dollars Per Year	Percent of Freshmen (N=818)	Percent of Total N	Percent of Sophomores (N=626)	Percent of Total N	Percent of Juniors (N=540)	Percent of Total N	Percent of Seniors (N=367)	Percent of Total N	Percent of Total (N=2351)
10,000 or more	14.6	5.1	18.7	5.0	17.2	4.0	13.4	2.1	16.1
7,000 - 9,999	15.8	5.5	14.7	4.0	15.6	3.8	13.4	2.1	15.1
6,000 - 6,999	12.5	4.3	12.1	3.2	12.8	3.0	12.0	1.9	12.4
5,000 - 5,999	17.1	6.0	17.6	4.7	19.1	4.4	21.5	3.4	18.4
4,000 - 4,999	15.5	5.4	15.0	4.0	12.8	3.0	14.7	2.3	14.6
3,000 - 3,999	10.0	3.5	8.8	2.3	10.9	2.5	11.2	1.7	10.1
2,000 - 2,999	5.3	1.8	3.4	0.9	3.3	0.8	4.4	0.7	4.2
1,000 - 1,999	1.6	0.5	2.4	0.6	2.6	0.6	3.0	0.5	2.3
0 - 999	1.7	0.6	1.8	0.5	2.0	0.5	1.4	0.2	1.7
Not reported	6.0	2.0	5.6	1.5	3.7	0.9	5.2	0.8	5.2
Total	100.0	34.7	100.0	26.7	100.0	23.5	100.0	15.7	100.0

* This represents parental income as estimated by the student. The accuracy of these estimates may be open to question.

The re-enrollment plans of the sampled student body have been summarized in Table Ir.

Two salient facts emerge from Table Ir: (1) most Temple students decided to remain in college; and (2), combining the "No's" and the "Uncertains", financial considerations played the greatest role in the decision to leave the university as reported on the questionnaire.

TABLE Ir

RE-ENROLLMENT PLANS FOR THE FRESHMAN, SOPHOMORE, JUNIOR, AND SENIOR CLASSES OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

	Freshman (N=818)	Sophomore (N=626)	Junior (N=540)	Senior (N=367)	Total (N=2351)
Yes - Plan to re-enroll	87.5	81.2	61.9	56.1	75.0
No - Do not plan to re-enroll					
No statement	1.0	2.2	4.4	4.6	2.7
Academic matters	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.4
Financial matters	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.8	0.4
Health/family matters	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.4
Uncertain about re-enrollment					
No statement	1.1	1.4	3.3	5.7	2.4
Academic matters	0.7	2.7	2.0	1.6	1.7
Financial matters	5.4	4.5	3.2	3.8	4.4
Health/family matters	1.8	3.4	5.6	5.2	3.7
No response	1.7	3.7	18.7	20.4	9.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Finally, opinions were obtained from the sample of 2,351 students in regard to certain college experiences. The questions, answered either "Yes" or "No", are reproduced below with some pertinent commentary.

TABLE Is

ATTITUDE TOWARD "COLLEGE EXPERIENCES" OF ACTIVE STUDENT BODY OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Statement	Percent Yes	Percent No
1. "I have had little difficulty thus far in meeting college expenses."	58.6	41.4
2. "I have had to spend too much time earning my expenses."	25.0	75.0
3. "I have tried to get scholarships, assistance (or additional scholarship assistance) but have not succeeded."	13.4	86.6

TABLE Is (Cont'd)

Statement	Percent Yes	Percent No
4. "I have tried to obtain employment to help meet my college expenses but have not succeeded." (Questions 1 to 4 dealt specifically with financial problems. It is evident that a sizable portion of Temple University undergraduates have had some difficulty in this area.)	7.5	92.5
5. "I have been generally interested in my studies."	91.1	8.9
6. "I have been satisfied with my grades."	48.0	51.0
7. "I have been satisfied with most of my teachers." (Most of the Temple students seem to approve of their instructors.)	82.5	17.7
8. "I have had ample opportunity for social activities." (This may be a reflection of the large number of students at Temple who are actively employed while attending college....school, homework, and employment leave little time for social activities.)	60.1	39.9
9. "I have found sufficient time to participate in non-academic activities." (The above substantiates and lends credence to the supposition that employment encroaches severely on a student's leisure time.)	44.8	55.2
10. "I have clear educational objectives."	62.0	38.0
11. "I feel that at times I have been treated unfairly by college."	9.5	90.5

Summary

Section one, concerning problems of meeting college expenses for the active student body of Temple University, clearly showed that the "myth

of the four year college loaf" does not apply to students at Temple University. Out of a total sample student population of 2,351, only 18.2 percent received as much as 90-100 percent of their income for educational purposes from their family or relatives; 20.9 percent received no assistance from their families, and 28.7 percent received varying amounts of funds ranging from 20 to 59 percent of their college expenses.

Although 18.2 percent of the purposive sample of Temple University students received 90-100 percent of their income from the home or from relatives, Table Ic shows that 50.2 percent of the students did not rely on personal savings to support themselves to any marked degree. For example, 13.2 percent of the sampled student body depended upon personal savings to provide for 10 to 19 percent of their needs, and 12.9 percent utilized personal savings for 20-39 percent of their needs.

College finances provided by church funds (1.1 percent), and civic organizations (0.9 percent) were insignificant sources of financial assistance for Temple University students (See Tables If and Ig).

Outside of family assistance, personal savings, and student jobs, "College and other scholarships" furnished the largest source of student income in the sample (Table Im). However, only 1.9 percent of the students relied on scholarships to provide from 80 to 100 percent of all funds used to defray college expenses.

Approximately 60 percent of Temple University students were employed. Only 38.0 percent of the active student body did not spend some time gainfully employed.

Off campus work provided at least some funds for a total of 60.9

percent of Temple University students, on campus work contributed some funds for a total of 10.7 percent, and other funds, not specified in the questionnaire, provided 14.1 percent of the income of the student sample.

Evidently the student body at Temple University must rely heavily on off-campus work and personal savings to support themselves through the college years. Furthermore, it is assumed that personal savings, to some extent, represent monies derived from employment.

A basic problem faced by the University administration is to determine how adversely the student's work load affects the quality and progress of his academic achievement. Obviously, a 40 hour work load plus fifteen to twenty hours of classtime must hurt the chances of a student obtaining the full educational benefits from his college years.

12.9 percent of Temple University students worked full time, while 47.9 percent worked part-time (Tables In and Io; - full time was defined as 40 hours or more per week). 12.6 percent worked 30 to 40 hours a week; 18.1 percent worked 19 to 29 hours per week; and the remainder of the sampled population distributed the work load randomly in terms of numbers of hours per week for a given percentage of students. If nineteen or more hours per week are considered as an excessive work load, then 34.0 percent of Temple University students are excessively burdened.

The reported family income of Temple University students suggested why most of them were forced to supplement their funds by working. 32.9 percent of the 2,351 responding to the questionnaire reported parental income as being under $5,000 a year. This figure may be less than actual income, but no check of veracity of report could be made.

The possible ambiguity of the questionnaire produced a reversed

relationship in the area of Re-enrollment Plans. 56.1 percent of seniors intended to continue their college education, while 87.5 percent of the freshmen expressed the desire to complete college. Many of the seniors probably construed "continued college education" as post-graduate work. As far as continuing their college education was concerned, 75 percent of the total active student body in the sample answered affirmatively; 15.9 percent were "uncertain" or "negative" about their re-enrollment plans. Of the 4.2 percent who definitely decided not to return, most (2.7 percent) did not explain the basis for their decision. Of the 12.2 percent who were undecided about returning, financial matters loomed as one of the major factors in their uncertainty.

58.6 percent of the student body sampled experienced little difficulty in meeting college expenses, and 25.0 percent reported they had to spend too much time earning college expenses.

39.9 percent stated that they did not have ample opportunity for social activities. In view of the financial standing of Temple University students and the time spent gainfully employed, this could be expected. Moreover, 55.2 percent did not feel they had sufficient time to participate in non-academic activities.

Despite the fact that the typical Temple University student must work to defray his college expenses, and does not have sufficient time for extracurricular activities and private social life, he accepts the situation and apparently holds favorable attitudes toward his teachers and the administration in general, as shown by the attitudinal responses in Table Is.

SECTION II (FORM C): CIRCUMSTANCES ATTENDING DISCONTINUANCE OF ENROLLMENT AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Form C questionnaires (see Appendix) were mailed to 300 students who had discontinued their attendance at Temple University. 108 replies were received. These were analyzed to determine the pattern of factors involved in a student's decision to leave Temple University. The questionnaire, supplied by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the twenty participating colleges and universities, consisted of five major areas. These were:

1. Estimates of the percentages of funds, in terms of sources, that were devoted to defraying total college expenses.
2. Attitudes toward their college experiences.
3. Plans for re-enrollment in Temple University or in another institution.
4. Present employment.
5. Factors involved in the student's decision to withdraw, including circumstances that would have permitted the student to continue at Temple University.

The information obtained from this questionnaire was reduced by coding to tabular form. Brief statements are presented in this section to summarize the important factors concerning discontinuance of enrollment at Temple University as revealed by each table, and a summary is presented at the close of this section to integrate the factors shown, and to present possible conclusions from the trends revealed in the tables.

There were 108 student respondents from the 300 solicited in the "drop-out" group. Tables IIa, IIb and IIc contain a general description

of this group in terms of sex, class and high school quintile. Additional data on the normative characteristics of this "drop-out" population was not requested on the form and hence any interpretations should be considered only in the light of the information which was obtained.

TABLE IIa
CLASSIFICATION BY CLASS AT TIME OF DROP-OUT
FROM TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Class		Percent
Freshman	Class of 1960	47.2
Sophomore	Class of 1959	13.0
Junior	Class of 1958	6.5
Senior	Class of 1957	2.8
Not known		30.6
	Total (N=108)	100.0

TABLE IIb
QUINTILE RANK IN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS
OF DROP-OUTS FROM TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Quintile Rank	Percent
First	13.9
Second	20.4
Third	10.2
Fourth	20.0
Fifth	5.6
Unknown	38.0
Total (N=108)	100.0

TABLE IIc
SEX OF DROP-OUTS FROM TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Sex	Percent
Male	66.7
Female	32.4
Sex not reported	0.9
Total (N=108)	100.0

The fact that 47.2 percent of drop-outs were Freshmen indicated a need for further study of the specific problems of first year students. This further study should include not only academic adjustment, social adjustment, and family status, but should attempt to integrate these factors with financial needs.

TABLE IId
FUTURE PLANS CONCERNING COLLEGE ENROLLMENT
FOR DROP-OUTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Plan	Percent
Do not plan to enroll anywhere at any time	18.5
Plan to enroll at Temple University in the near future	14.8
Plan to enroll at some other university	18.5
Plan to enroll at Temple University eventually	40.7
Undecided about returning to college	7.4
Total (N=108)	100.0

Of the 55.5 percent of this group who intended to re-enroll at Temple University, only 14.8 percent intended to enroll in the "near future", while 40.7 percent intended to enroll "eventually". 18.5 percent of the "drop-out" group had decided to enroll at another university.

Table IIe shows the expected date of return of the drop-outs to Temple University.

The percent of former students planning to re-enroll and those former students with no intent of returning was approximately equal. Specific intentions of re-enrollment at Temple University were reported by 36.1 percent of the drop-outs; 37.0 percent did not plan to return; 26.8 percent were uncertain either about returning or the date of their return.

TABLE IIe

EXPECTED DATE OF RE-ENROLLMENT FOR
DROP-OUTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

	Percent
No plan to return	37.0
Not certain about returning	7.4
Not certain about when returning	19.4
Registered in evening, February, 1957	2.8
Fall of 1957	7.4
Later in 1957-1958 school year	6.5
Fall of 1958	8.3
After fall of 1958	11.1
Total (N=108)	100.0

For those students who enrolled in some other institution, Table IIf shows the type of college or university selected. The great majority of the "drop-out" group, 78.8 percent, had not enrolled elsewhere at the time the questionnaire was completed.

TABLE IIf

BREAKDOWN OF INSTITUTIONS (OTHER THAN TEMPLE)
WHERE DROP-OUTS HAVE RE-ENROLLED (N=108)

Institutions	Percent
Pennsylvania colleges similar to Temple University[1]	
Privately controlled	4.6
Publicly controlled	0.9
Pennsylvania colleges dissimilar to Temple University	
Privately controlled	5.6
Publicly controlled	0.0
Out of state universities	
Privately controlled	6.5
Publicly controlled	2.8
Have not re-enrolled elsewhere	78.8
No reply	0.9
Total (N=108)	100.0

[1] A University privately controlled, receiving public funds.

The percent of drop-out students who enrolled in similar, dissimilar and out of state universities was so small that no conclusion concerning preference could be drawn for the 20.3 percent who had enrolled at other institutions. However, the great majority of the "drop-outs" group, 78.8 percent, had not enrolled elsewhere.

77.7 percent of the "drop-out" group were employed at the time the questionnaire was completed; 69.4 percent full time, and 8.3 percent part-time (Table IIg). Even though it was expected that students who drop out of college would normally seek employment, this high percentage of full time employment may in part be an indication of the financial problems of the "drop-out" group.

Table IIh gives the occupational status of those in the "drop-out" group who were employed when the questionnaire was administered.

TABLE IIg

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF DROP-OUTS
FROM TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

	Percent
Full-time	69.4
Part-time	8.3
Unemployed	21.3
No answer	0.9
Total (N=108)	100.0

TABLE IIh

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS (INCLUDING PART TIME JOBS) FOR THE DROP-OUTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY AS CLASSIFIED BY THE DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES

Occupational Status	Percent
Professional	10.2
Semi-professional	5.6
Managerial and Official	1.9
Clerical and Kindred	25.9
Sales and Kindred	3.7
Service	17.6
Skilled	3.7
Semi-skilled	2.8
Unskilled	3.7
Unemployed	23.1
Occupation not given	1.9
Total (N=108)	100.0

A direct attempt was made in the questionnaire to elicit the one most important reason for discontinuance of attendance at Temple University (Table IIi).

Financial need (32.4 percent) and academic difficulties (32.2 percent) were the two major causes as reported by the drop-outs, for their decision to leave school. Furthermore, the third largest category, Health and Family, accounted for 27.9 percent of the group, and the reasons necessitating withdrawal classified in this category again may be in part due to financial need, or may in part represent factors that need further study - possibly by the technique of depth interviews - before final assignment concerning the import of this section can be made.

Additional data for factors contained in the questionnaire, other than those listed in Table IIi, causing drop-outs at Temple University are reported in Tables IIj-A and IIj-B.

TABLE III

THE ONE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR LEAVING
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY AS REPORTED BY THE 108 DROP-OUTS

	Percent	
Academic, not elsewhere classified	1.9	
Poor grades	6.5	
Not interested in courses	12.6	
Inconvenient schedule	1.9	
Vocational change	6.5	
Not yet ready for college	2.8	
		32.2
Financial, not elsewhere classified	7.4	
Lack of funds	19.4	
Had to go back to work	5.6	
		32.4
Health and Family, not elsewhere classified	3.7	
Sickness of self	7.4	
To get married	3.7	
Sickness of family	1.9	
To have a child	1.9	
To be with husband	3.7	
Domestic difficulty	5.6	
		27.9
General dissatisfactions	1.9	
Social life on campus	0.9	
Involved in too many non-academic activities	0.9	
Age	0.9	
To enter service	2.8	
No response	0.0	
		7.4
Total (N=108)	100.0	

TABLE IIj-A

ADDITIONAL FACTORS (OTHER THAN THOSE LISTED IN TABLE IIi) CAUSING DROP-OUTS FROM TEMPLE UNIVERSITY*

	Percent
Military Service	1.9
Married or plan to be married	4.6
Illness or physical disability of self or family	12.0
Homesick, lonesome, unhappy	8.3
Disciplinary - Probation or dismissal for non-academic reasons	0.9
Faculty	0.9
No answer	75.9
(N=108)	

TABLE IIj-B

ADDITIONAL FACTORS (OTHER THAN THOSE LISTED IN TABLE IIi) CAUSING DROP-OUTS FROM TEMPLE UNIVERSITY*

	Percent
Academic difficulties or problems	20.4
Financial difficulties or problems	32.4
Lack of interest in studies	17.6
General dissatisfaction	11.1
Orientation and guidance	5.6
Administration, rules and regulations	3.7
No answer	39.8
(N=108)	

* Computed on the basis of total number of checks other than those listed in Table IIi. Students were permitted to check as many factors as were deemed applicable so the total percent exceeds 100.

As a secondary factor, financial difficulty once again emerges as the most frequent variable which caused students to discontinue attendance at Temple University. Academic difficulties and lack of interest in studies were also important. A combination of the two factors, financial and academic, was not investigated because of the small number of drop-outs involved.

A further attempt to arrive at the possible causative factors in the drop-out group, is reported in Table IIk. The former students were asked to state the one circumstance which, if altered, would have enabled them to remain at Temple University.

Although many factors are given, financial need in some form, 30.5 percent, and academic adjustment, as represented by the first seven factors in the table (33.4 percent) constituted the major classifications concerning circumstances that should be altered.

TABLE IIk

CIRCUMSTANCES, WHICH IF ALTERED, WOULD HAVE CAUSED DROP-OUTS TO REMAIN IN COLLEGE

	Percent	
Poor grades	5.6	
Not interested in courses	7.4	
Inconvenient schedule	6.5	
Vocational change	5.6	
Not yet ready for college	6.5	
School not interested in students	0.9	
Had to study too long	0.9	
		33.4
Financial, not elsewhere classified	4.6	
Lack of funds	13.9	
Had to go back to work	7.4	
No loan granted	4.6	
		30.5
Sickness of self	4.6	
Sickness in family	0.9	
To get married	0.9	
To have baby	1.9	
To be with husband	1.9	
Domestic difficulty	5.6	
		15.8
Dissatisfaction, not elsewhere classified	0.9	
General dissatisfactions	1.9	
Social, religious, not elsewhere classified	0.9	
Miscellaneous, not elsewhere classified	1.9	
Age	0.9	
To enter service	1.9	
		8.4
No answer	12.0	
Total (N=108)	100.0	

The various sources of funds used to defray college expenses by students who have discontinued attendance at Temple University revealed the importance of off-campus work, personal savings, and family help as sources of funds, especially when compared to scholarships and other sources. It may be conjectured that when some contingency arises to drain or stop monies from these categories, the student may be forced to drop out (Table III).

TABLE III

TOTAL BREAKDOWN BY PERCENTAGE OF ALL FUNDS USED TO DEFRAY COLLEGE EXPENSES FOR THE DROP-OUTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY (N=108)

	P E R C E N T						
	1-19	20-39	40-59	60-79	80-100	Total Each Category	Uncodable*
Family and relatives	9.3	6.5	12.0	4.6	23.2	59.3	3.7
Personal savings	15.7	12.0	11.1	4.6	8.3	54.5	2.8
On-campus work	4.6	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0
Off-campus work	11.1	19.4	9.3	4.6	6.5	52.8	1.9
Church	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.9
Civic organizations	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
College scholarships	1.9	2.8	3.7	0.9	0.9	10.2	0.0
Other scholarships	1.9	2.8	2.8	1.9	0.0	10.2	0.9
College loan funds	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.9
Other loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other funds	0.0	2.8	5.6	5.6	3.7	17.6	0.0

* Due to student errors in answering questionnaires.

The attitudes toward college experience expressed by the "drop-out group" point to the basic role played by "financial problems" in the college career of Temple University students. The vast majority of drop-outs expressed to some degree the attitude that financial needs negatively influenced their college standing. These attitudes are reported in Table IIm.

TABLE IIm

ATTITUDE OF DROP-OUTS FROM TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
TOWARD CERTAIN COLLEGE EXPERIENCES
(N=108)

Attitudes	Yes Percentage	No Percentage
I was not sufficiently interested in my studies	34.3	65.7
My grades were too low	29.6	70.4
I was dissatisfied with some of my teachers	19.4	80.6
My social activities were too limited	13.9	86.1
I had difficulty meeting financial costs	46.3	53.7
I became involved in too many non-academic activities	11.1	88.9
I had to spend too much time earning my expenses	29.6	70.3
I had no clear educational objectives	31.5	68.5
I felt I was treated unfairly by the college	3.7	96.3
I planned to be married and could not afford to stay at Temple University	6.5	93.5
I tried to get a scholarship but did not succeed	4.6	95.4

Academic and financial factors loomed large in the reported attitudes of the drop-outs. Difficulty in meeting college expenses, 46.2 percent, was most frequently checked. The necessity for spending too much time in earning expenses, 29.6 percent, ranked in a tie for fourth among the eleven attitudinal factors investigated. Only 4.6 percent left college because they tried to get a scholarship and did not succeed. This question does not reveal how many of the drop-outs actually tried for a scholarship and so it is difficult to interpret. Certainly a minority group expressed the need for this type of financial aid.

Ranking second, third and tied for fourth among the attitudinal factors are statements that have to do with academic adjustment. Lack of sufficient interest, 34.3 percent, no clear cut educational objective,

31.5 percent, and grades too low, 29.6 percent, all seem to portray a group of students who have attitudes at variance with standards for good academic adjustment. These attitudes seemed to be personal because 96.3 percent answered "no" to the question concerning unfair treatment by Temple University.

Summary

The salient facts about the problems of students as reported by the 108 respondents who discontinued their attendance at Temple University, revealed the important role of financial need in the pattern of factors for dropping out of school. Academic difficulties and attitudinal factors also played a part in causing drop-out.

Almost half of Temple University students who dropped out of school did so in their freshman year. The male to female ratio of "drop-outs" was approximately two to one, corresponding roughly to the proportionate representation in the active student population (See Tables Ia and IIc).

The majority of the drop-out group (74 percent) expressed the intention of returning to college at some future date, and 55.5 percent of the group intending to return to college planned to return to Temple University. This might indicate that temporary financial exigencies as well as possible academic adjustment problems forced these students out of school.

While only 12.9 percent of the active Temple University population engaged in full time employment, 69.4 percent of the "drop-outs" were working full time. This high percentage was expected. 32.4 percent of the drop-out group listed finances as the one most important reason for leaving college, and when this is coupled with the fact that 79.1 percent

of the active student body received aid from family and/or relatives as compared to the 59.3 percent of the drop-outs who received such aid, the emerging role of finances in the pattern of socio-economic and attitudinal factors becomes apparent.

On the whole, the drop-outs expressed favorable attitudes toward college that were very similar to the general student population.

Lack of sufficient interest in studies, lack of clear educational objectives, as well as personality and adjustment problems were all merged with the financial aspects of the drop-out problem. The data also suggested that drop-outs bear a financial onus which is somewhat heavier than that of the average student. Also the drop-out group depended heavily upon off-campus work, and personal savings, as well as family help, as sources of funds to defray college expenses as compared to comparatively little assistance from scholarships and other sources.

SECTION III (FORM B): REPORT ON COLLEGE APPLICATION, ADMISSION, AND REGISTRATION

This section, based on answers to a questionnaire (See Appendix), concerns itself with those students who had been accepted to Temple University, but who for one reason or another did not choose to attend. Four hundred questionnaires covering all such applicants for the school year of 1956-57 were mailed, and 136 replies were received. This is admittedly a limited but workable sample. The possibility of sampling bias on the part of respondents should be considered in interpreting the data.

Specifically, the following information was called for:

1. A list of all the institutions where a formal application for admission was filed (this applies to the Fall entering class of 1957 only), together with the action taken by each institution.
2. Total amount paid to above institution(s) in the form of non-refundable application fees.
3. Institution in which individual enrolled.[1]
4. Present enrollment status.
5. Three most influential considerations governing decision to enter a particular institution.
6. Any financial assistance awarded by institution in which enrolled.
7. Any financial assistance from other sources - applicable only to the institution in which enrolled.
8. The <u>one</u> factor considered most important in determining the institution entered.
9. Reasons for failure to enroll in college.[2]

---

1 Items 3 to 8 apply only to students who enrolled in an institution of higher education during the school year 1956-1957.

2 Items 9 to 11 apply only to students who did not enroll in an institution of higher education during the school year 1956-1957.

10. Is the individual still interested in enrolling in college? If so, where and when?
11. The most important factor influencing decision not to attend college.
12. Attitude toward the proposal to award the greater part of scholarship funds on the bases of need and performance in college, rather than on the bases of high school records, test results and/or high school recommendations.

The data collected from this questionnaire was treated in much the same fashion as in the preceding sections. Tables relevant to the general purposes of our inquiry were constructed together with additional explanatory comments. The major findings are summarized at the conclusion of the section.

Students who were accepted to Temple University but who did not choose to attend can be roughly classified into two groups: those who applied to other institutions, and those who limited their applications to Temple University. In one case, the problem is why an accepted student decided not to attend college; while in the other case, the problem is why a student selected another school. Table IIIa is a percentage breakdown of the non-attendant group of admitted students at Temple University on the basis of applications to other colleges exclusive of Temple University.

The majority of non-attendants at Temple University (65.4 percent), submitted one or two applications to other schools; 39.7 percent submitted one application and 25.7 percent submitted two applications. Only 8.8 percent applied only to Temple University.

TABLE IIIa

NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS TO COLLEGES EXCLUSIVE OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY FOR THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Applications	Percentage
None but Temple University	8.8
One	39.7
Two	25.7
Three	12.5
Four	7.4
Five	4.4
Six	1.5
Total (N=136)	100.0

One of the purposes of this study was to determine whether or not Temple University was losing students to its competitors. Of the total non-attendant group, 52.2 percent enrolled at Pennsylvania colleges similar to Temple University and 16.9 percent enrolled in out of state colleges similar to Temple University.

TABLE IIIb

INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY ENROLLED

	Percentage
Pennsylvania colleges similar to Temple University[1]	
Privately controlled	38.2
Publicly controlled	14.0
Pennsylvania colleges dissimilar to Temple University	
Privately controlled	11.8
Publicly controlled	0.0
Out of state colleges similar to Temple University	
Privately controlled	14.7
Publicly controlled	2.2
Out of state colleges dissimilar to Temple University	
Privately controlled	2.2
Publicly controlled	0.0
None	16.9
Total (N=136)	100.0

[1] Temple University is classified as a University which is privately controlled but receives public funds.

Of the entire non-attendant group, 83.1 percent enrolled at another institution. The one most important factor for not enrolling in another institution, as shown in Table IIIc, was the students' inability to meet either the tuition costs or the concomitant living expenses of any of the other institutions to which he was admitted.

TABLE IIIc

ONE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR FOR NOT ENROLLING IN ANOTHER INSTITUTION FOR THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Factor	Percentage
I was not admitted to school of my first choice	4.3
I could not afford to attend any of the institutions to which I was admitted	43.5
I was drafted for military service	0.0
I enlisted for military service	8.7
I took a full-time job	0.0
I became ill	4.3
I was needed at home	8.7
Family problems	17.4
Didn't want to go	4.3
No answer	8.7
Total (N=23)	100.0

Although only 23 cases comprised the total sample of students who chose not to attend college, lack of funds appeared to play the major role in their decision since 43.5 percent of this group reported that they could not afford to attend any of the institutions to which they were admitted.

Basic to a solution of the problem, "Is Temple University losing good students to its competitors?" is the knowledge of what factors cause an admitted student to enroll in another institution. Table IIId lists

the eleven possibilities considered in the questionnaire mailed to the "non-attendant" group.

TABLE IIId

MAIN FACTOR FOR ENROLLING IN ANOTHER INSTITUTION
FOR THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS
OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Factor	Percentage
Near enough to home to commute	5.2
Received financial assistance from the institution in the form of a scholarship	13.2
High scholastic standing of the institution	22.1
Friends were going there	0.7
Parent(s) and alumni desired attendance	2.2
Less expensive than other(s) to which student was admitted	6.6
Institution had good intercollegiate athletic record	0.0
Student activities and social opportunities	1.5
Buildings and other features of the campus	5.2
Wanted to be away from home	5.9
Appropriate courses and curriculum	16.9
Not enrolled in another institution	16.9
No answer	3.7
Total (N=136)	100.0

The high scholastic standing of the institution accounted for 22.1 percent of the responses, 16.9 percent selected another institution because of appropriate courses and curricula relating to the students' chosen career, and 13.2 percent selected another institution because of financial assistance in the form of a scholarship.

A check of the questionnaire forms disclosed the principle reason for choosing "appropriate courses and curriculum" as a main factor for enrolling in another institution. Most of these selections were made on the basis of highly specific curricula. For example, five students desired

to attend a college where the "co-operative plan" was offered; other students specified a "Hebrew Academy", a "conservatory of music", and other similarly specialized fields of study. A list was also compiled of the colleges chosen by those who attended another institution because of its "high scholastic standing", as checked on the questionnaire. Fifty percent of these students chose a nearby "Ivy League" school, and most of the other selections seemed to center about colleges reputed to be "older schools".

In brief, "high scholastic standing" seemed to be equated by many of these students to "high social standing" and does not really reflect discredit upon the scholastic reputation of Temple University. Also the possible biased nature of the sampling, together with the limited number of people who checked "appropriate courses and curriculum" (23 cases) and "high scholastic standing" (30 cases), precludes establishing these two factors as major determinants in a student's decision to attend another college. However, further study in this area may be warranted for a larger sample randomly selected.

Temple University attracts most of its students from Philadelphia and its suburbs, and it was not expected that funds for housing requirements would play an important role in declining admission to Temple University. Table IIIe confirms this supposition. 79.5 percent of the non-attendant group resided in Pennsylvania and 72.1 percent stated that no "housing problem" was involved. Of the 11 percent whose home residence was in a different state, 8.8 percent required housing. Presumably, where "housing is involved", the student could not live with relatives or friends.

TABLE IIIe

HOUSING REQUIREMENTS OF THOSE STUDENTS WHO HAD BEEN ACCEPTED BY TEMPLE UNIVERSITY BUT HAD NOT CHOSEN TO ATTEND

	Percentage
Home residence in same state as Temple (Pennsylvania)	
Housing involved[1]	7.4
No housing involved	72.1
Home residence in different state than Temple	
Housing involved	8.8
No housing involved	2.2
No information given	9.6
Total (N=136)	100.0

[1] Distance was such as to require living away from home, as stated by student.

Tables IIIf to IIIj evaluate the caliber of the admitted non-attendant in terms of his high school record, his conditional or non-conditional acceptance to Temple University or other colleges, and his continued enrollment in another institution.

Table IIIf shows that on the bases of high-school quintile rank in their graduating class, the "admitted non-attendant" is apparently a capable student. 49.3 percent finished in the first quintile of their class and 19.8 percent in the second quintile.

TABLE IIIf

QUINTILE RANK IN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS FOR THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Quintile	Percentage
First	49.3
Second	19.8
Third	5.2
Fourth	2.9
Fifth	2.9
Not given on records	1.5
No information given	18.4
Total (N=136)	100.0

Of the total group of admitted non-attendants, 86.0 percent were admitted to other institutions without conditions; 48.5 percent were admitted to two institutions (Temple University and one other), on this basis, and 25.0 percent to three institutions. Only 12.5 percent were admitted only to Temple University.

TABLE IIIg
NUMBER OF APPLICANTS ACCEPTED WITHOUT CONDITION AT OTHER COLLEGES FOR THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Applications	Percentage
Only Temple University	12.5
One	48.5
Two	25.0
Three	8.1
Four	3.7
Five	0.7
Accepted with condition	1.5
Total (N=136)	100.0

The corollary to these non-conditional acceptances at other institutions is the percent of admitted non-attendants who were accepted elsewhere with condition; 4.4 percent were accepted at one institution with condition, 1.5 percent at two other institutions, and 0.7 percent at three other schools.

TABLE IIIh
NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS ACCEPTED WITH CONDITION AT OTHER COLLEGES FOR ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Applications	Percentage
One	4.4
Two	1.5
Three	0.7
None	93.4
Total (N=136)	100.0

Other colleges rejected or placed on a waiting list, a total of 26.5 percent of the admitted non-attendant group. 18.4 percent of the group were rejected on one application, 5.2 percent on two applications, and 2.9 on three.

TABLE IIIi

NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS REJECTED OR PLACED ON WAITING LIST AT OTHER COLLEGES FOR ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Applications	Percentage
One	18.4
Two	5.2
Three	2.9
None	73.5
Total (N=136)	100.0

The only measure available of the success of the admitted non-attendant student at other institutions was the student's continued enrollment at that institution. At the time of this study 80.9 percent were currently enrolled at some other institution, 0.7 percent left after the beginning of the second registration period, 16.7 percent never enrolled, and no information was available for 1.5 percent.

TABLE IIIj

ENROLLMENT STATUS AT OTHER COLLEGES OF ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Status	Percentage
Currently still enrolled	80.9
Left during or at end of first registration period	0.0
Left after beginning of second registration period	0.7
No reply	1.5
Never enrolled	16.9
Total (N=136)	100.0

Tables IIIl to IIIn are focused on financial assistance granted to students for the admitted non-attendant group at Temple University.

Table IIIk indicates when this financial assistance was tendered in terms of the time the students were admitted to another institution.

TABLE IIIk

TIME OF ADMITTANCE TO ANOTHER INSTITUTION FOR ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

	Percentage
Fall of 1956	27.2
Second registration period, 1956-1957	0.0
Fall of 1957	47.1
After fall of 1957	6.6
No answer	2.2
Not enrolled	16.9
Total (N=136)	100.0

The total yearly amount of financial assistance received from other institutions is shown in Table IIIl.

TABLE IIIl

TOTAL YEARLY AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE RECEIVED FROM OTHER INSTITUTIONS BY ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Financial Assistance Per Year in Dollars	Percentage
1500 and above	0.0
1000 - 1499	1.5
700 - 999	5.2
600 - 699	2.2
500 - 599	1.5
400 - 499	1.5
300 - 399	1.5
200 - 299	1.5
1 - 199	0.7
No assistance	64.7
Not enrolled	16.9
No answer	2.9
Total (N=136)	100.0

13.4 percent received as high as $200.00 to $999.00 per year from other institutions, while a total of 64.7 percent received no assistance.

Table IIIm shows type of financial assistance rendered by universities to prospective students. 12.5 percent were scholarship grants, 2.2 percent scholarship and work, and 0.7 percent provided work opportunity only.

TABLE IIIm

TYPE OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE RECEIVED FROM OTHER INSTITUTIONS BY ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Type of Assistance	Percentage
Scholarship grant	12.5
Work opportunity	0.7
Scholarship and work	2.2
No assistance received	64.7
No answer	2.9
Not enrolled in another institution	16.9
Total (N=136)	100.0

Table IIIn deals with financial assistance offered admitted non-attendant students other than scholarship and work opportunity.

TABLE IIIn

AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN THAT LISTED IN TABLE IIIl RECEIVED BY THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Financial Assistance Per Year in Dollars	Percentage
$1000 - 1499	1.5
700 - 999	0.7
600 - 699	0.0
500 - 599	0.7
400 - 499	5.9
300 - 399	0.0
200 - 299	0.7
1 - 199	0.7
No assistance	64.0
Not enrolled	16.9
No answer	8.8
Total (N=136)	100.0

10.2 percent of the admitted non-attendant group received at least some financial assistance from "other sources".

Five attitudinal questions were included on the questionnaire in an attempt to uncover the attitudes of these students toward the awarding of scholarships to prospective college students.

TABLE IIIo

RESPONSES OF THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY TOWARD FIVE ATTITUDINAL QUESTIONS (N=136)

Statement	Percentage	
	Agree	Disagree
Many good students need scholarship aid even to get started in college.	72.8	27.2
Too much scholarship money is wasted on poor or mediocre students	25.0	75.0
Colleges must use scholarship funds to attract athletes, debaters, dramatic stars, musicians, and others with specialized abilities.	11.0	89.0
Brilliant students should be recognized by scholarship awards regardless of need.	15.4	84.6
High school grades and test results are dependable indices of performance in college	25.0	75.0

An overwhelming majority, 89.0 percent, believed that scholarship funds should not be used to attract athletes, debaters, dramatic stars, musicians, and others with specialized abilities.

At the same time, they reflected their own financial needs expressed in other sections of this study by generally agreeing that many good students must be financially assisted in order to begin college work - 72.8 percent agreed and 27.2 percent disagreed with this statement.

The group also agreed, that present scholarship funds were not

wasted on poor or mediocre students. Furthermore, they reported that financial need should be considered a more basic requirement for scholarship aid than intellectual brilliance.

Question five produced rather surprising results considering that the great majority of this group was in the first and second quintile of their high school graduating class. 75.0 percent did not believe that high school grades and test results are dependable indices of performance in college.

To a certain extent the population of this group differed from the populations represented at Temple University, and in the other samples used in this study. The proportion of males to females at Temple University is roughly two to one in favor of males, but the admitted non-attendant group who answered the questionnaire showed a slight preponderance of females. This is a possible limitation for direct comparison with the other groups.

TABLE IIIp

SEX OF THE ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS
OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

	Percentage
Male	44.1
Female	46.3
Sex Unknown	9.6
Total (N=136)	100.0

An opinion of admitted non-attendants at Temple University toward the statement in Table IIIq was sought as a possible means for evaluating the student attitude toward the awarding of scholarships.

TABLE IIIq

OPINION OF ADMITTED NON-ATTENDANTS AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY CONCERNING THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:

Some authorities propose that colleges award the greater part of their limited scholarship funds on the bases of need and performance in college rather than on the bases of high school records, test results and/or recommendations.

Opinion	Percentage
Agree	52.2
Disagree	41.9
No answer	5.9
Total (N=136)	100.0

52.2 percent affirmed their belief that colleges should award the greater part of their scholarship funds on the basis of need and performance in college.

Summary

When compared to the proportionate representation of men and women in the active Temple University population, the admitted non-attendants showed a preponderance of women.

The first salient item which developed from the data confirmed the importance of finances in the life of the prospective student. Lack of sufficient funds to defray college expenses constituted the primary single reason for the decision not to attend any college or university, and the ubiquity of the financial factor throughout Section III testified to its importance.

Other attitudinal factors emerged from Tables IIIc, IIId, IIIo, and IIIq, but because of the possible bias in the mail sample and the compar-

atively limited number of respondents in the various attitudinal categories, it was deemed unfeasible to attempt to develop attitudinal responses into major factors for the non-attendant group.

Most Temple University students reside in Philadelphia and its environs. Therefore, it was anticipated that housing would not play a significant role in keeping students away from Temple University. This supposition was confirmed: 74.3 percent of the non-attendants stated that no housing was required.

Of the students who chose to attend some other university, 64.7 percent received no college scholarship aid as compared to 82.2 percent of the students currently enrolled at Temple University who reported that they received no scholarship (See Section I, Table Ih). Again, we can make no definitive statements because of possible bias in the sample of non-attendants. Temple University is providing a substantial number of scholarships but it does seem from this data that there is an even greater need for such assistance. An analysis of information obtained from the registrar's files covering the school years of 1956-1957, shows that an average of 31.2 percent of students who attended Temple University were in the upper one fifth of their class; 49.3 percent of the entire accepted non-attendant group were in this category. This would suggest that Temple University is in fact losing some good students.

In conclusion, the results obtained from the sample of accepted non-attendants emphasized the importance of finances in a student's life and suggests that further study in two major areas may be warranted: (1) the increased need for scholarship funds to defray college expenses; (2) the role of student attitudes in shaping the decision not to attend school and/or to attend colleges other than Temple University.

SECTION IV: AN OVERVIEW

In order to obtain insight into the problems confronting college students, the Temple University college population was divided into three separate categories: (1) Those students actively enrolled at Temple University; (2) those students who had dropped out prior to graduation; and (3) those students who were accepted to Temple University but who decided not to attend. The three groups were considered to have distinct characteristics in terms of the problems they faced both as active college students and as prospective students, hence different questionnaires supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were administered to each population. Although the differences among questionnaires seriously limited statistical cross comparisons among and between the three sample populations, such comparisons were made where feasible.

This section also includes a recapitulation of the more important findings gleaned from the previous three sections, and interrelates these findings on the basis of appropriate statistical procedures. The results and conclusions of the statistical analysis were oriented toward the major considerations outlined in the general introduction. These were:

(1) Are good students failing to enroll in college because of financial reasons?

(2) Is Temple University losing good students to its competitors because of basic policy concerning scholarship and curricula?

(3) Where does financial need fit into the pattern of factors affecting discontinuance of attendance at Temple University?

(4) At what point in a student's career is financial need a most critical factor, and what steps can the University take to

alleviate the hardships of its students?

Analysis of the data relating to source of income for defraying college expenses for the active population, revealed that the majority of students at Temple University were compelled either to rely on personal savings or to seek employment in order to meet the costs of their college education. Only 18.2 percent of the total purposive sample of 2,351 cases received from 90 to 100 percent of their college tuition and concomitant expenses from family or relatives. Approximately 60 percent of Temple University students sampled were engaged in some type of gainful employment. Only 38 percent of the active student body did not work.

Employment and family provided varying sources of funds to defray college expenses for the active student population; half of the sample (49.9 percent) utilized personal savings in various amounts to augment their funds to meet college expenses.

12.9 percent of Temple University students worked full time, and 47.9 percent worked part time. An investigation of the estimated family income of Temple University students suggested why many were forced to work in order to attend college: 32.9 percent reported parental income to be under $5,000 per year. The veracity of these estimates of parental income could not be checked, but if these figures are assumed to be accurate, then clearly some students must have resorted to sources of funds other than parental contributions to defray college expenses.

After family assistance and student employment, "college and other scholarships" furnished the largest source of student income in the "active" sample. College scholarships accounted for 20 to 59 percent of the income of 9.6 percent of the sample, while 12.9 percent of the sample reported

that other scholarships provided 20 to 59 percent of their funds to meet college expenses. 82.2 percent of the active population received no college scholarship aid in any amount, but when college scholarships and "other" scholarships are combined, 39 percent of Temple University students reported the receiving of scholarship aid (See Table Im), leaving 61 percent who received no such aid.

The exact role played by financial considerations in the re-enrollment plans of the active student body at Temple University is difficult to assess in light of the normative data obtained from the questionnaire. When a student attributed a decision concerning re-enrollment plans to financial need, this possibly included other factors such as health and family matters, academic standing, and personal reactions to college experiences.

In order to investigate the complex interplay of the relations between family income, hours worked, and various attitudinal factors for the actively attending student population of Temple University, a special correlation procedure appropriate to this data was employed - the contingency coefficient (Table IVa).

The relationships presented in Table IVa were low but statistically significant. The highest relationship (C=.27) established the positive association between ease of meeting college expenses and the finances of a student's parents. The converse of this positive association was the negative correlation (-.25) between family income and time spent earning expenses. As was to be expected, opportunity for social activities was related to the number of hours a student worked: a negative correlation of -.24 was found between hours worked and "opportunity for social activities".

TABLE IVa

CHI SQUARE VALUES, MEASURES OF SIGNIFICANCE, AND CONTINGENCY CORRELATIONS* BETWEEN HOURS WORKED, FAMILY INCOME AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE EXPERIENCES FOR 2351 STUDENTS ACTIVELY ENROLLED AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Variables		χ^2	Significance	C
Hours worked	Family income	58.2	.01	-.16
Hours worked	Statement: "I have had ample opportunity for social activities."	122.6	.01	-.24
Hours worked	Statement: "I have been satisfied with my grades."	26.3	.01	-.11
Family income	Statement: "I have had little difficulty thus far in meeting college expenses."	181.2	.01	.27
Family income	Statement: "I have had to spend too much time earning my expenses."	147.4	.01	-.25

* The Coefficient of contingency is derived from Chi Square by the formula

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}}$$

The number of hours a student worked showed a negative relationship to family income, i.e., the lower the family income the more hours the student worked. A negative relationship also existed between the number of hours a student worked and his reported satisfaction with grades (C= -.11). Although this correlation was low, it was definitely significant, and possibly reflected the students' fee ings that better grades could be attained by easing the work load.

From the statistical analysis shown in Table IVa it seemed evident that financial need represents a problem for the Temple University students selected in this sample. This naturally raised the question as to

whether or not the students who dropped out of Temple University faced graver financial burdens than those who stayed on. The most conspicuous difference between the active and the drop-out groups resided in the greater importance of "financial needs" for the drop-out group; 32.4 percent of the drop-outs listed "finances" as the one most important reason for leaving school. Furthermore, while 79.1 percent of the active student body received aid from the family and relatives toward defraying college expenses, only 59.3 percent of the drop-out group received such aid.

The male to female ratio of the drop-out group was approximately two to one which corresponded roughly to the proportion in the active student body.

Financial problems, lack of sufficient interest in studies, and lack of clear educational objectives comprised major attitudinal factors toward school experiences, and, no doubt, all played a role in causing drop-outs.

The data suggested that the financial onus was somewhat heavier for the student who dropped out.

Certain t values were computed between the drop-out and active groups for two areas where financial comparisons were possible. A significant t of 4.25 was obtained between the percentage of funds contributed by family and relatives to defray college expenses; also, a significant t of 5.45 was obtained for the attitudinal response "I have been generally interested in my studies". Both t values were significant at the .01 level of significance. It can be said with confidence that the drop-outs were less interested in their studies, and that they received less financial aid from their family than did the actives. Before any unequivocal con-

clusion attributing "drop-outs" to financial need is made further study is required to reveal the position of finances in the pattern of factors that normally exists in a major decision such as discontinuing a college education. While it is assumed that the questionnaire elicited truthful responses from the students, it is socially acceptable to attribute dropping out of college to financial need, and the student who reported financial need as the sole reason for discontinuing college may have arbitrarily selected only one of the many factors that influenced his decision.

An important fact to remember about the non-attendant group (those students who had been accepted to Temple University but did not choose to attend), is that 69.1 percent of this group graduated in the upper 40 percent of their high school graduating class. Ostensibly some good students are selecting schools other than Temple University because of "appropriate courses and curriculum" (22.1 percent), or because of reputed "high scholastic standing" (13.2 percent).

A further analysis of the data revealed that these choices probably reflected specialized needs and/or social attitudes and did not constitute any real academic indictment of Temple University by this small group.

The responses of the admitted non-attendants of Temple University toward five attitudinal questions seemed to center around the financial aspects of college attendance. The great majority felt that scholarships should be awarded on the basis of financial need, and that many good students need scholarship aid to start college. Although the size of the sample and the nature of the questionnaire for this group precluded statistical cross-comparisons with the other two groups, it may be conjectured that their attitudes toward the basic problems confronting the college

student are similar, especially in regard to financial problems.

Almost half of the Temple University students who dropped out of school did so in their freshman year. This would indicate that any steps the university might take to aid its students should be taken as early as possible. The lack of discouragement of the drop-out group is revealed by the fact that 74 percent of the drop-outs planned to re-enroll in college at some future date; 55.5 percent expressed the intention of returning to Temple University.

Sufficient data was obtained to provide some tentative answers to the questions posed in the introduction:

1. Students are failing to enroll in college because of finnncial reasons. While admittedly the N is small, (23 cases), 43.5 percent of the admitted non-attendants could not attend college because of reported financial reasons. This fact, when related to the expressions of financial hardship attested to by the drop-out group, indicates that a certain segment of our prospective college population may be deprived of a college education because of lack of funds.
2. Temple University is losing a number of students to its competitors. The number of such students sampled was too small to permit definitive conclusions; but attitudinal considerations and offers of financial aid seemed to play some part in attracting students to other colleges.
3. Financial need is the one most reported reason for discontinuance at Temple University. Other factors complicate the picture, and

further study is needed in regard to attitudinal and academic variables that affect withdrawal from college.

4. About one half of the drop-out group left school at the end of the freshman year. Possibly these students entered college without adequate funds, but it may be that a certain percentage of these students dropped out for other reasons, even though they reported finances as the principal factor causing withdrawal. The crucial time for financial aid would seem to be when the student begins school, not after his freshman year. Also, increased financial aid tendered during the freshman year may prompt some needy students to attend Temple University, who otherwise may be attracted to other colleges which offer greater monetary assistance.

In conclusion, it seemed likely that a broad complex of factors governed a students' decisions regarding registration or non-attendance, and continuance or discontinuance at Temple University. The one consistently emergent factor as brought out by the three questionnaires, seemed to be financial problems, and consequently this point was stressed in this report; however, further investigation of the contribution of attitudinal, academic, and personal factors utilizing adequate controls and larger samples, would seem to be warranted.

APPENDIX

FORM B: Report on College Application, Admission, and Registration

FORM C: Circumstances attending discontinuance of enrollment at Temple University

FORM D: Information from active student body concerning problems of meeting college expenses

Form B

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
Philadelphia 22, Pennsylvania
Report on College Application, Admission, and Registration

Name_____

1. List the institutions with which you filed a formal application for admission to the Fall of 1957 entering class and indicate, by a check-mark, what action was taken by each institution. (Do not include institutions from which you withdrew your application before final action had been reported to you by the institution.)

Name of Institution	ADMITTED		Placed on Waiting List	Rejected
	Without Condition	With Condition(s)		
A.				
B.				
C.				
D.				
E.				
F.				
G.				
H.				
I.				

2. What was the total amount you paid to the above institutions in the form of non-refundable application fees? $_____

Form B

ITEMS ON THIS PAGE APPLY ONLY TO STUDENTS WHO ENROLLED IN AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1956-1957

3. Institution in which you enrolled_____
When? _____

4. Are you now enrolled? Yes___: No___: If not, when did you leave? During or at end of first registration period_____: After beginning of second registration period_____.

5. Among the considerations listed below, check the three (3) you believe were the most influential in your decision to enroll in the institution you named in item 3. Add others if they apply.

_____ A. Near enough to my home so that I could commute.
_____ B. Received financial assistance from the institution in the form of a scholarship.
_____ C. High scholastic standing of the institution.
_____ D. Friends were going there.
_____ E. Parent(s) wanted me to go there.
_____ F. Less expensive than other(s) to which I was admitted.
_____ G. Institution had good intercollegiate athletic record.
_____ H. Student activities and social opportunities.
_____ I. Buildings and other features of the campus.
_____ J. _____
_____ K. _____
_____ L. _____

6. Were you awarded any form of financial assistance by the institution in which you enrolled?

Yes____: No____: If your answer is yes, what is the approximate amount (or equivalent) for a school year in the form of:

Scholarship Grant (include remission of fees and tuition)? $_____
Student Loan? $_____: Work Opportunity $_____.

7. Did you receive financial assistance from other sources applicable only to the institution in which you enrolled?

Yes____: No____: If your answer is yes, in what form?_____
_____ In what amount per year $_____.

8. What <u>one</u> factor do you think was most important in determining the institution you entered?_____

_____

Form B

ITEMS ON THIS PAGE TO BE ANSWERED ONLY IF YOU DID NOT ENROLL IN AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1956-1957

9. Check the three (3) most important reasons for your failure to enroll.

_____A. I was not admitted to school of my first choice.

_____B. I could not afford to attend any of the institutions to which I was admitted.

_____C. I was drafted for military service.

_____D. I enlisted for military service.

_____E. I took a full-time job.

_____F. I became ill.

_____G. I was needed at home.

_____H. _____

_____I. _____

_____J. _____

10. Are you still interested in entering college? Yes_____: No_____.

If your answer is yes, where?_____

When?_____.

11. What do you think was the one most important factor that influenced your decision not to attend college this year? _____

_____

_____

Form B

PLEASE ANSWER ITEMS ON THIS PAGE REGARDLESS
OF WHETHER OR NOT YOU ENTERED COLLEGE THIS YEAR

12. Some authorities propose that colleges award the greater part of their limited scholarship funds on the bases of need and performance in college rather than on the bases of high school records, test results and/or recommendations.

In general, how do you feel about the proposition? Agree___: Disagree ____.

Please check the statement(s) below which best represent(s) your reactions to the proposition.

_____ A. Many good students need scholarship aid even to get started in college.
_____ B. Too much scholarship money is wasted on poor or mediocre students.
_____ C. Colleges must use scholarship funds to attract athletes, debaters, dramatic stars, musicians, and others with specialized abilities.
_____ D. Brilliant students should be recognized by scholarship awards regardless of need.
_____ E. High school grades and test results are dependable indices of performance in college.
_____ F. _____
_____ G. _____

13. If we find that there are additional questions we would like to discuss with you would you be willing to be interviewed, either in person or by telephone?

Yes____: No____. If your answer is yes, please give the address and telephone number where you can be reached in the next few weeks.

_____
Address

_____ _____
Telephone

or _____
Address

_____ _____
Telephone

Temple University

Office of the Vice-Provost

Form C

Report on Circumstances Attending Discontinuance of Attendance at Temple University

1. Name _____

2. Have you enrolled in another institution since leaving Temple? Yes_____; No_____.

   If so, where?_____ When?_____

   If not, do you plan to enroll in another institution? Yes____; No___.

   If so, where?_____

3. Do you plan to return to Temple? Yes___; No___. If so, when?_____.

4. Are you now employed? Full-time____; Part-time____; No____. If so, what is the nature of your work?_____

   _____

   _____

5. What is your one most important reason for dropping out of Temple?____

   _____

   _____

6. List, in order of importance to you, the other factors that caused you to drop out._____

   _____

   _____

   _____

7. Under what circumstances would you have continued as a student at Temple?_____

   _____

Form C

8. Report, for the total period of your college attendance, your estimates of the amounts and percentages of funds, in terms of sources, that were devoted to defraying your total college expenses. (Include in total expenses such items as tuition, fees, books and supplies, room rent, meals, fraternity or sorority dues, recreation and entertainment, health, grooming, clothing, laundry, travel, and contributions to church and charity. If, for example, you waited on tables for part or all of your meals, estimate the cash equivalent of such work.) Write 0 on the lines for each item that was not a source of funds.

_____% Family, including relatives
_____% Personal savings*
_____% On-campus work**
_____% Off-campus work**
_____% Church
_____% Civic organization(s)
_____% College scholarship(s)
_____% Other scholarship(s) - specify:
_____
_____% College loan funds
_____% Other loan(s)
_____% Other funds - specify:
_____

* Include savings from summer earnings
** While in school

9. Check the statements below that are essentially true as they relate to your experiences at Temple:

_____ A. I was not sufficiently interested in my studies.
_____ B. My grades were too low.
_____ C. I was dissatisfied with some of my teachers.
_____ D. My social activities were too limited.
_____ E. I had difficulty meeting financial costs.
_____ F. I became involved in too many non-academic activities.
_____ G. I had to spend too much time earning my expenses.
_____ H. I had no clear educational objectives.
_____ I. I felt I was treated unfairly by the (college).
_____ J. I planned to be married and could not afford to stay at Temple.
_____ K. I tried to get a scholarship but did not succeed.

10. If we find that there are additional questions we would like to discuss with you would you be willing to be interviewed, either in person or by telephone?

Yes_____; No_____. If your answer is yes, please give the address and telephone number where you can be reached.

Next few weeks:

(1) _____ _____
Address Telephone

After June: _____

(2) _____ _____
Address Telephone

Temple University — Office of the Vice-Provost

Form D

INFORMATION FROM ACTIVE STUDENT BODY
CONCERNING PROBLEMS OF MEETING COLLEGE EXPENSES

1. Report, for the total period of your college attendance, your estimates of the percentages of funds, in terms of sources, that were devoted to defraying your total college expenses. (Include in total expenses such items as tuition, fees, books and supplies, room rent, meals, fraternity or sorority dues, recreation and entertainment, health, grooming, clothing, laundry, travel, and contributions to church and charity. If, for example, you waited on tables for part or all of your meals, estimate the cash equivalent of such work.) Write 0 on the lines for each item that was not a source of funds.

_____% Family, including relatives
_____% Personal savings*
_____% On-campus work**
_____% Off-campus work**
_____% Church
_____% Civic organization(s)
_____% College scholarship(s)
_____% Other scholarship(s) - specify: _____
_____% College loan funds
_____% Other loan(s)
_____% Other funds - specify _____

* Include savings from summer earnings
** While in school

2. In the table below, check the bracket that represents your estimate of your parent's or parents' 1956 income (wages, salaries, profits, interest, dividends).

Loss	☐
$ 0 - 999	☐
1,000 - 1,999	☐
2,000 - 2,999	☐
3,000 - 3,999	☐
$ 4,000 - 4,999	☐
5,000 - 5,999	☐
6,000 - 6,999	☐
7,000 - 9,999	☐
10,000 or more	☐

Form D

3. Check the statements below that are essentially true as they relate to your experiences at (college).

_____ A. I have been generally interested in my studies.
_____ B. I have been satisfied with my grades.
_____ C. I have been satisfied with most of my teachers.
_____ D. I have had ample opportunity for social activities.
_____ E. I have had little difficulty thus far in meeting college expenses.
_____ F. I have found sufficient time to participate in non-academic activities.
_____ G. I have had to spend too much time earning my expenses.
_____ H. I have clear educational objectives.
_____ I. I have tried to get scholarship assistance (or additional scholarship assistance) but have not succeeded.
_____ J. I feel that at times I have been treated unfairly by (college) particularly with respect to _____
_____
_____ K. I have tried to obtain employment to help meet my college expenses but have not succeeded.

4. Are you now gainfully employed (A) full time? ☐ ; part time ☐ . Not at all ☐ . If so, for how many hours per week? _____
What is the nature of your work? _____
_____

5.* Do you plan to re-enroll for further study at (college)? Yes ☐ ; No ☐ ; uncertain ☐ . If your answer is "no" or "uncertain" please state what changes in circumstances, either at the college and/or with you, would change your plans with reference to re-enrollment.

_____
_____

Name (optional) _____ Class of 19___ Date_____

_____

* Students who expect to graduate no later than this summer may omit this item.